REMEDIAL SITE ASSESSMENT DECISION - EPA REGION II Page 1 of 1

	CELIA 3 LAUNDINT	State ID:
Alias Site Names:		
City: SAN JUAN	County or Parish: SAN JUAN	State: PR
Refer to Report Dated: 07/01/2005	Report Type: SITE INSPECTION 001	
Report Developed by: EQB		
DECISION:		
_	sment under CERCLA (Superfund) is not require	i .
X 1a. Site does not qualify for (No Further Remedial Action	further remedial site assessment under CERCLAn Planned - NFRAP)	
1b. Site may qualify for acti	on, but is deferred to:	
2. Further Assessment Needed	Under CERCLA:	
2a. Priority: Higher	Lower	
2b. Other: (recommended a	action) NFRAP (No Futher Remedial Action Planned	Ł
DISCUSSION/RATIONALE:		·
referenced site, at this time. The basis for the no fu NFRAP designation means that no additional reme warranting further Superfund consideration or cond decision regarding the tracking of NFRAP sites, the	has determined that no further remedial action by the Federal Supurther remedial action planned (NFRAP) determination is provided dial steps under the Federal Superfund program will be taken at tilitions not previously known to EPA regarding the site are disclose referenced site may be removed from the CERCLIS database alound interest is warranted. Archived sites may be returned to the Ceration is discovered.	I in the attached document. A he site unless new information ed. In accordance with EPA's and placed in a separate archival
covered parking area, two small concrete-covered a dry-cleaning process utilizes tetrachloroethylene. The system consists of a ditch covered by a metal screem achine. The collected solvent is pumped into a 55 during the 2001 site reconnaissance, five corroded the site. Two of these wells, located downgradient for the site.	aning operations. The site is rectangular in shape and consists of areas and a large area with exposed soil. The laundry is located the process is conducted over a concrete platform with a containmen, and was designed to collect tetrachloroethylene accidentally 5-gallon tank. If 55-gallon drums were observed on the exposed soil area. Thereform the site, were closed in 1987 due to contamination with volations.	I on the first floor of the building. The nent system. The containment released from the dry-cleaning are 27 public wells within 4 miles of
ppm) were detected in soil samples at concentratio	water samples were collected from the site. Lead (260 ppm), merns higher than three times the background sample concentration exceeded the Contract Required Concentration Limits (CRQLs).	
detected in groundwater and soil samples. Therefo into groundwater or soil. 2) There is no evidence to	lanned (NFRAP) under CERCLA. This decision is based on the force, the chemical analysis does not show the release of the dry-clean indicate that the site-related contaminant entered any of the controundwater are not associated with the dry-cleaning process.	eaning solvent (tetrachloroethylene)
		· .
	•	
•		
	•	
Site Decision Made by: ALEX KOSTIC	<i>l. H</i>	
Signature:	Alex Los hi	Date: 11/29/2005
<u> </u>		